

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 8 and 14 have been amended for clarity.

Claims 8 and 14 stand rejected, under 35 USC § 102(e), as being anticipated by Cheshire (US 2005/0125545). Claim 9 stands rejected, under 35 USC § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Cheshire in view of Bakshi (US 6,457,054). Claims 10-13 stand rejected, under 35 USC § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Cheshire in view of Melick et al. (US 7,376,191). To the extent these rejections may be deemed applicable to the amended claims, Applicants respectfully traverse as follows.

Claim 8 now defines a communication apparatus that, for every transmission of information data: (1) receives a response to a link establishment request from a receiving side communication apparatus, (2) transmits information data to the receiving side communication apparatus using a link established by the link establishment request, and (3) transmits a link establishment request for transmission of next information data before terminating a link for transmitting current information data.

Cheshire discloses, in Fig. 3, a personal computer 200 that transmits a DNS request to a network access device 210. If no link is established between network access device 210 and DNS server 220, network access device 210 transmits an imposter domain name to personal computer 200. Thereafter, personal computer 200 transmits a DNS request to network access device 210 for the imposter domain name. The Advisory Action proposes that this disclosure by Cheshire corresponds to the Applicants' claimed subject matter of receiving a response to a link establishment request from a receiving side communication apparatus and transmitting

information data, matching the link establishment request, to the receiving side communication apparatus.

However, claim 8 now recites transmitting information data to a receiving side communication apparatus using a link established by a link establishment request previously transmitted to the receiving side communication apparatus. Cheshire's personal computer 200 does not transmit an imposter domain DNS request in a link established by a previous DNS request or in a link established by any DNS request. Instead, Cheshire's personal computer 200 and network access device 210 communicate without requiring a DNS link establishment request.

Cheshire's DNS request only establishes a link between network access device 210 and DNS server 220. And because Cheshire's personal computer only transmits an imposter domain DNS request when no link exists between network access device 210 and DNS server 220, it necessarily follows that Cheshire cannot disclose the Applicants' claimed subject matter of transmitting, after receiving a response to a link establishment request from a receiving side communication apparatus, information data (e.g., Cheshire's imposter domain DNS request, as characterized by the Advisory Action) to the receiving side communication apparatus using a link established by the link establishment request (e.g., Cheshire's DNS request).

Moreover, because Cheshire's imposter domain DNS request does not establish a link between network access device 210 and DNS server 220, it also necessarily follows that Cheshire's imposter domain DNS request cannot establish a link between network access device 210 and DNS server 220 for every transmission of information data (e.g., Cheshire's imposter domain DNS request, as characterized in the Advisory Action). The Applicants' claimed subject matter establishes a link for every transmission of information data.

Furthermore, Cheshire does not disclose transmitting a DNS request for establishing a link for the transmission of next information data before terminating a link for transmitting current information data between network access device 210 and DNS server 220. Thus, it follows that Cheshire does not disclose the Applicants' claimed subject matter of transmitting a link establishment request for transmission of next information data before terminating a link for transmitting current information data.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that Cheshire does not anticipate claim 8. Independent claim 14 similarly recites the above-mentioned subject matter distinguishing apparatus claim 8 from the applied references, but with respect to a method. Therefore, the rejections applied to claims 9-13 are obviated, and allowance of claims 8 and 14 and all claims dependent therefrom is deemed to be warranted.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: April 9, 2009  
JEL/DWW/att  
Attorney Docket No. 009289-04161  
Dickinson Wright PLLC  
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 659-6966  
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559

James E. Ledbetter  
Registration No. 28,732